UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,156	10/28/2003	Paramjit Kahlon	OIC0097US	6587

60975   7590   03/23/2011
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE
BLDG. H, SUITE 250
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER
OBEID, FAHD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3627	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/23/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 January 2011</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24 and 33-36</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24 and 33-36</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/24/2011 has been entered.

Preliminary Remarks

2.   This is in reply to communication filed on 01/24/2011.

3.   Claims 25-32 have been cancelled.

4.   Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 33, and 34 have been amended.

5.   Claims 35 and 36 have been added.

6.   Claims 1-24 and 33-36 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   The factual inquiries set forth in Graham **v.** John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4.   Claims 1-24 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Coleman (US 5,708,828) in view of Balgeman (US 5,446,880), and further in view of

Katz (US 2002/0178077).

5.   <u>Regarding Claims 1-3, 9-11, and 33-36</u>: Coleman discloses a computer implemented

method comprising:

- synchronizing existing target information with source information, wherein the existing

   target information is stored in a target inventory location record at a target system, the

   source information is stored at a plurality of source systems, the plurality of source

systems are ones of a plurality of computer systems, the target system is another of the

plurality of computer systems, (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);

The synchronizing comprises:

- o extracting the source information from a plurality of source records (abstract,

  figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13),

- o at least one of the plurality of source location records is extracted from a first

  source system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13),

- o at least one of the plurality of source location records is extracted from a second

  source system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13),

- o the source information from each of the plurality of source records is in one of a

  plurality of source formats, and each one of the plurality of source formats

  corresponds to at least one of the plurality of source systems (abstract, figs.2B, 3,

  C1 L9-13);

- generating intermediate source location information by converting the source location

  information into an intermediate format (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);

- converting the intermediate source information into target location information, wherein

  the target location information is in a target format, and the target format corresponds to

  the target system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);

Coleman does not explicitly teach determining whether a target location record exists at a target

system, if the target location record exists at the target system, updating the target location record

with the target location information, if the target location record does not exist at the target

system, creating the target location record at the target system and storing the target location

information in the target location record.

However, Balgeman does disclose the following:

- (claims 34 & 36) determining whether a target location record exists at a target system, if

    the target location record exists at the target system, updating the target location record

    with the target location information, if the target location record does not exist at the

    target system, creating the target location record at the target system and storing the

    target location information in the target location record (C8 L54-60, claims 3, 6, 7, & 9);

While, Katz does teaches inventory location information (¶¶ 39, 42)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to use Balgeman's and Katz's teachings in Coleman's "system for

converting data from input data using first format to output data using second format" enabled,

for the advantage of minimizing inventory management data conversions and to facilitate data

exchanging between customers and suppliers in the automotive industry. Also, for the advantage

of providing a communication system which provides flexibility by allowing individual nodes to

utilize different databases and which automatically updates corresponding records at different

databases with a minimum of burden on the users (Balgeman; C1 L66-67, C2 L1-2).

6.   Regarding Claims 4 and 12: Coleman discloses a method of claim 1, wherein from the at

least one of the plurality of source location records, the extracting extracts less than all first

source location information, and from the at least one of the plurality of source location records

from the second source system, the extracting extracts less than all second source location

information (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13).

7.   Regarding Claims 6, 20, and 21: Coleman discloses a method of claim 5, wherein each

of the plurality of address elements comprises: an address identifier element; an address base

data element, wherein the address data cleansing data element includes a disable cleansing flag

element; an address data cleansing data element; an address relationship data element; and an

address custom data element (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13).

8.   Regarding Claims 7 and 22: Coleman discloses a method of claim 6, wherein the address

relationship data element comprises: an address effective end date element; an address

occupancy type code element; an address effective start date element; an address type code

element; and an address list of roles element (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13).

9.   Regarding Claims 5, 8, 13-19, and 23-24: Coleman substantially discloses the claimed

invention. However, Coleman does not appear to explicitly teach hierarchy of data elements

includes a plurality of inventory location elements,

        However, Katz disclose a method of claim 4, wherein the hierarchy of data elements

includes a plurality of inventory location elements, wherein each of the plurality of inventory

location elements includes: an identifier for identifying the inventory location element; a base

data element for defining: a location description; a location name; and a location type code; a list

of addresses element for defining a plurality of address elements from a party class; a list of

related business units elements for defining a plurality of business units associated with the

inventory, and wherein each of the plurality of business units associated with the inventory

includes an identifier element; a list of related inventory locations for defining a plurality of

related inventory locations; and a custom data element for defining customized attributes for the

inventory (¶¶ 39, 42, 43, 46, 54).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to use Katz's teachings in Coleman's "system for converting data from input

data using first format to output data using second format" enabled, for the advantage of

minimizing inventory management data conversions and to facilitate data exchanging between

customers and suppliers in the automotive industry.

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In

particular the applicant argues that: a) the cited references fail to disclose "extracting source

inventory location information from a plurality of source inventory location records, where at

least one of the plurality of source inventory location records is from a first source system and at

least one of the plurality of source inventory location records is from a second source system".

In response to a) examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that claims must

be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Coleman teaches a data conversion system and

method which converts data between different software and hardware platforms. A data

conversion language/engine (DCLE) which converts data from any number o different type or

formats from any of various platforms to a single common data standard having a predefined

generic data type, and the data is then converted from this generic type to a new desired format

or type and stored on an existing or new destination platform (abstract & fig.2B & C7 L45-53).

The DCLE system offers true multi-platform design capabilities, allowing conversion of legacy

mainframe data to any modern relational database management system (RDBMS), or from any

RDBMS to any mainframe platforms, or custom application can be connected to the platform of

choice. The DCLE may also be used to convert data to a non-platform basis for data warehouse

usage. Batch automation allows for hands-free data conversion on a nightly, weekly, or yearly

basis which is perfectly suited for data warehousing (C7 L1-14).

Therefore, the combination of the cited references still meet the scope of the limitations as

currently claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to FAHD A. OBEID whose telephone number is (571)270-3324.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fahd A Obeid/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627
March 20, 2011